UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,785	04/18/2001	Young Francis Day	2000P09095 US01	9919

7590 02/24/2005

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/837,785	DAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 19-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 19-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to Applicants Arguments or Remarks filed on 10/26/2004.

2. Claims 1-14 and 19-25 are currently pending. Claims 1, 19, 22, and 24 are independent claims.

Priority

3. This application clams benefit under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of provisional patent application 60/259,610, filed on December 18, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-13, 19, 20, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747.

Independent Claim 1

Zaharkin teaches a system for *transforming a document from a first format to a different second format, said document being encoded in a language including presentation style determination attributes* (see pg.1 - [0002]), comprising:

a source of transformation parameters determining a desired presentation style and content structure (pg. 2 – [0026] → includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined parameters describing how the disambiguation process operates);

an input document processor for transforming a received input document in a first format (pg. 2 – [0025] → receives document of ambiguated and/or ambiguous data) *by parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a hierarchically ordered structure representing an intermediate document structure* (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034], [0036], [0037]; pg. 4, [0057] → system includes a mapper that receives a document. The mapper creates a mapping file from the document); and

a transformation processor for transforming said intermediate document structure into an output document with said desired presentation style of a second format in response to said transformation parameters (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Claim 4

Zaharkin further teaches a system including *a filter for excluding undesired information from said output documents* (pg. 3 – [0039] → a path is filtered if it is not acceptable to the DTD with tag inference in reference to, or based on, the rules of the markup language of the DTD, such as SGML).

Claim 5

Zaharkin further teaches *a sorting processor...output document* (pg. 1 – [0008] → mapping file having one node representing each possible mapping of an element of the DTD to a portion of the document).

Claim 6

Zaharkin further teaches a *system wherein said input documents and said output documents are different...multimedia file* (pg. 1 - [0002]; pg. 4 – [0046] → i.e. SGML converted into XML or vice versa).

Claim 7

Zaharkin further teaches *transformation parameters identifying input document type and output documents type* (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Claim 8

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said source of transformation parameters comprises an SGML document* (pg. 1 – [004]; pg. 4 – [0046]).

Claim 9

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation processor transforms said intermediate document structure into said output document...by performing at least one of...reordering operation...document structure* (pg. 3 – [0037]; pg. 4 – [0056] → DTD **reorders** by declaring where each tag is allowed and which tags can appear within other tags).

Claim 11

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation parameters include transformation rules...into said output documents* (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Claim 12

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation rules map elements...hierarchical tree structure...output documents* (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034]-[0037] → elements are mapped into a hierarchical tree structure of the DTD).

Claim 13

Zaharkin further teaches a system including *a management processor for determining said transformation parameters...desired presentation style* (pg. 2 – [0026] → i.e. disambiguator).

Independent Claim 19

Adaptive processing system claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 20

Zaharkin teaches the adaptive processing system wherein *said second format for presentation on at least one display device from, (a) a mobile or non-mobile phone, (b) a personal data assistant device, (c) a PC, (d) a TV (e) another processing device* (see pg 2 – [0019]-[0024] → i.e. computer monitor).

Independent Claim 24

Method claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 25

Zaharkin further teaches a method wherein *said converting step includes applying transformation rules mapping elements...output element* (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 3, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747, in view of Sorge et al. ("Sorge"), U.S. Patent No. 6,613,098.

Claims 2 and 3

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach including a *preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules...in accordance with said conflict resolution rules* and *a preprocessor for correcting errors in at least one of, (a) said input document, and (b) said transformation parameters.*

However, Sorge teaches a processor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and errors due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Since Zaharkin and Sorge are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Sorge would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Sorge to include a preprocessor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and errors due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Independent Claim 22

With respect to independent claim 22, refer to the rationale relied upon to reject claim 1. Zaharkin does not specifically teach including a *preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules...in accordance with said conflict resolution rules.*

However, Sorge teaches a processor for recognizing and resolving conflicts due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Since Zaharkin and Sorge are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Sorge would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Sorge to include a preprocessor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-

67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Claim 23

Zaharkin teaches a method for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 22 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *Adopting...allocating content...determined display page style.*

However, Zaharkin teaches the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

8. Claims 10, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747.

Claim 10

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *Adopting...allocating content...determined display page style.*

However, Zaharkin teaches the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

Claim 14

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach a system *wherein said transformation parameters include at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition.*

However, Zaharkin teaches parameters which specify markup syntax of the DTD and output file (pg. 2 – [0026]) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include transformation parameters including at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Claim 21

Zaharkin teaches an adaptive processing system with respect to independent claim 19 as discussed above but does not specifically teach a system wherein said selected second format is

selected from at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format.

However, Zaharkin teaches a computer using operating systems such as Microsoft Windows or Apple MacOS operating systems which are well-known in the art to include (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling formats and (c) a non-scrolling formats for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first contends that Zaharkin fails to disclose "parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a *hierarchically ordered structure*." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to previously cited [0057] *et seq.* and corresponding Figures 6 and 7 of the Zaharkin reference. Zaharkin discloses parsing an input document into an intermediate mapping file data structure prior to converting the document into markup language. The mapping file data structure includes one or more segments. A segment is one or more candidate paths starting with a common solid node and ending with a common

terminal node. Figure 7 is a diagram of the mapping file data structure which is a trees structure representing the first segment 610 in Figure 6. The mapping file data structure shown in Figure 7 is clearly a series of ordered groupings of elements. Therefore, Zaharkin discloses parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a *hierarchically ordered structure.*

Applicant further contends that Zaharkin fails to disclose "a management processor for determining transformation parameters *in response to input data identifying a selected second format for presentation on a display device.*" Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to pg. 2 – [0025] and pg. 4 – [0055]. The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator the determines the transformation parameters from the DTD and then converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD.

Lastly, Applicant contends that Sorge does not teach "resolving conflicts arising *due to transformation parameters...to produce compatible transformation parameters.*" Giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation without reading limitations of the specification into the claim, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sorge teaches a format conflict resolving method and system (see col. 12 lines 35-67 to col. 13 lines 1-34). This formatting conflict is resolved for the specific purpose of transforming parameters of a spreadsheet data document into compatible parameters of the end-HTML markup file during the conversion process.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER